

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the specification and current Abstract have been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice, where a Replacement Abstract is the enclosed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully decline to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

Further, claims 1-16 have been amended to delete reference designations. In addition, claims 6-8 and 11-12 have been amended to overcome the objections thereto under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 6-8 and 11-12 is respectfully requested. The claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserves all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 8-9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and if the rejection to claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is

overcome. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 8-9 contain allowable subject matter. As discussed above, claim 8 has been amended to overcome the rejection thereto. Further, claims 8-9 have been rewritten in independent form, where features of claim 2 not needed for patentability have not been included in independent claims 8-9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-9 are in allowable form, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,978,041 (Matsuda). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claims 1-7 and 10-16, as well as new claims 17-21, are patentable over Matsuda for at least the following reasons.

As correctly noted by the Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action, Matsuda enhances the brightness of a picture B, which a portion of the display 3101 shown in FIG 49, by increasing the voltage of picture B to include both voltage from a power source 3113 and control voltage from cont., which is increased from 0V to pV (column 39, line 2). The brightness of the rest of the display outside picture B (picture B being a portion of the display 3101), referred to as text picture A is not changed, which brightness of

text picture A is caused by the power source 3113, where the control voltage from cont. is 0V.

In summary, Matsuda increases the brightness of portion B by increasing its voltage, while leaving unchanged the brightness (and thus voltage) of the rest of the display 3101, which is the text picture A outside the portion B. The Examiner has recognized that the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 13-21, requires increasing the illumination of the display, and then decreasing the amplitude of the video signal outside the window, thus resulting in a brighter window. According to the Examiner, this is equivalent to Matsuda.

While the end result of the present invention and Matsuda may appear to be similar, where the brightness of a display portion or window is increased, there is nothing equivalent between Matsuda and the present invention with regard to the particular ways the window brightness is increased. Increasing display illumination and decreasing the video signal amplitude outside the window portion is diametrically opposite the teaching of Matsuda, where brightness of the window portion is increased by adding a control voltage cont. to the power source 3113, while only using the power source 3113 (without the control voltage cont.) for providing the

brightness of the entire screen 3101. Accordingly Matsuda, where a voltage is added to increase brightness of portion B, teaches away from the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 13-21, where display illumination is increased and brightness outside the window is decreased.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13-21 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 and 10-12 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any informalities remain, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned in order to expedite allowance.



PATENT  
Serial No. 10/055,396  
Amendment in Reply to Office Action of January 7, 2004

Please charge any fee deficiencies and credit any overpayments  
to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By *D. Halajian*  
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9607  
March 18, 2004

Enclosure: Replacement Abstract

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence  
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

On March 18, 2004  
(Date of Mailing)  
By *Natalie H. Mandy*  
(Signature)